



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/717,680	11/21/2000	Martyn S. Lovell	777.334US1	9114
41505	7590	04/10/2006		
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103				
			EXAMINER KANG, INSUN	
			ART UNIT 2193	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/717,680	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LOVELL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Insun Kang	<b>Art Unit</b> 2193	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 12-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 12-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 1/10/2006.
2. As per applicant's request, claims 1, 15, and 22 have been amended. Claims 1-9 and 12-28 are pending in the application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 15-20, and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coad et al., U.S. Patent 6,851,107 (hereinafter referred to as Coad) in view of Dye et al. (US Pub. 2004/0158812) hereafter Dye, further in view of Banning et al., U.S. Patent 5,485,567 (hereinafter referred to as Banning), still further in view of Rivlin, U.S. Patent 6,032,159.

Per claim 1:

Coad discloses: a source code editor operable to edit a source code module (e.g., Figure 2, ref no. 208 and related text)

-a graphical design surface operable to display a graphical object representing actual source code of the source code module (e.g., Figure 13 and related text).

Integrated testing is well known, however, Coad does not explicitly teach providing integrated testing of the source code module. Dye teaches such feature was known in

Art Unit: 2193

the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to test programs in the development environment, such as those disclosed in Dye (par 0012). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Coad's disclosed system to incorporate the teaching of Dye. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to test source code to find errors as suggested by Dye.

Coad further discloses: upon a change in the source code module, the change in the source code is immediately communicated to the graphical design surface and the graphical design surface is updated to reflect the change in the source code module, wherein the design surface displays the graphical object, (i.e. col. 2 lines 43-52)

Coad does not explicitly disclose the graphical object represents a database object. However, Banning discloses a graphical object representing a column of a database (Abstract; column 5, lines 19 – 62; Figure 2), but does not explicitly disclose binding a variable to a database column, however, Rivlin discloses binding a variable to a column in a database. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the editing and binding of objects in a graphical window as taught by Coad with the graphical object representing a database column as taught by Banning and bound to variables as is well known and taught by Rivlin, because one would be motivated to clearly and concisely convey particular aspects of a database to a user and make changes via a window of information as taught by Banning in the Abstract.

Art Unit: 2193

Per claims 2, 8, and 9: see the previous office action.

Per claim 15, it is the method version of claim 1, respectively, and is rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 1 above.

Per claims 16-20, see the previous office action.

Per claims 22-27, they are the computer-readable medium versions of claims 15-20, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 15-20 above.

5. Claims 3-7, 21, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coad et al., U.S. Patent 6,851,107 (hereinafter referred to as Coad), in view of Dye et al. (US Pub. 2004/0158812), further in view of Banning et al., U.S. Patent 5,485,567 (hereinafter referred to as Banning), still further in view of Rivlin, and still further in view of Washburn et al. U.S. Patent 5,157,779 (hereinafter referred to as Washburn).

Per claim 3:

Neither Coad, Dye, Banning nor Rivlin teaches that: a changer manager...an application datastore...of the source code module. However, Washburn discloses this feature. See the previous office action.

Per claims 4 and 7:

Art Unit: 2193

Neither Coad, Dye, Banning nor Rivlin teaches that: the difference between the source code module and the previous version of the source code module is highlighted by sourced code editor. However, Washburn discloses this feature. See the previous office action.

Per claims 5 and 6:

Neither Coad, Dye, Banning nor Rivlin teaches that: the difference is highlighted using a squiggly line or a tooltip bar to highlight the difference. However, Washburn discloses this feature. See the previous office action.

Per claim 21:

Neither Coad, Dye, Banning nor Rivlin teaches that: reading a template having pre-configured software modules from a datastore. However, Washburn discloses this feature. See the previous office action.

Per claim 28, it is the medium version of claim 21, respectively, and is rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 21 above.

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coad et al., U.S. Patent 6,851,107 (hereinafter referred to as Coad), in view of Dye et al. (US Pub. 2004/0158812), further in view of Banning et al., U.S. Patent 5,485,567 (hereinafter referred to as Banning), still further in view of Rivlin, U.S. Patent 6,032,159, and still further in view of Peddada et al., US patent 6,031,159 (hereinafter referred to as Peddada).

Art Unit: 2193

Per claim 12:

Neither Coad, Dye, Banning nor Rivlin teaches that the binding is established through a drag-and-drop interface. However, Peddada discloses this feature. See the previous office action.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coad et al., U.S. Patent 6,851,107 (hereinafter referred to as Coad), in view of Dye et al. (US Pub. 2004/0158812), further in view of Banning et al., U.S. Patent 5,485,567 (hereinafter referred to as Banning), still further in view of Rivlin, U.S. Patent 6,032,159, and still further in view of Gupta et al., US patent 6,484,156 (hereinafter referred to as Gupta).

Per claim 13:

Neither Coad, Dye, Banning nor Rivlin teaches that: a package manager...are grouped together as a package. However, Gupta discloses this feature. See the previous office action.

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coad et al., U.S. Patent 6,851,107 (hereinafter referred to as Coad), in view of Dye et al. (US Pub. 2004/0158812), further in view of Banning et al., U.S. Patent 5,485,567 (hereinafter referred to as Banning), still further in view of Rivlin, U.S. Patent 6,032,159, and still further in view of O'Donnell et al., US patent 6,223,203 (hereinafter referred to as O'Donnell).

Art Unit: 2193

Per claim 14:

Neither Coad, Dye, Banning nor Rivlin teaches that: the package manager is further operative to receive a list of system identifiers...to deploy the package to. However, O'Donnell discloses this feature. See the previous office action.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 and 12-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of



Art Unit: 2193

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Insun Kang whose telephone number is 571-272-3724. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on 571-272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

I. Kang  
AU 2193



KAKALI CHAKI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100